

ATTACHMENT A Remarks

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 1 – 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as lacking patentable utility. Although this rejection is respectfully traversed, claims 1 – 21 have been amended to make it clear that the claimed invention is directed to statutory subject matter and is tied to a particular configuration of machines or apparatuses. More particularly, amended claims 1 – 21 are directed to a process for adapting a degree of interactivity between a participant computer equipment item and a reciprocal participant computer equipment item of a set of participant computer equipment items, when the participant computer equipment item and the reciprocal participant computer equipment item are subjected to an interactive dialogue, and include, *inter alia*, writing equipment and behavior identifiers and associations into a memory of the participant computer equipment item, and carrying out a procedure of authentication between the computer equipment items. Thus, claims 1 – 21 now clearly recite structure and actions having patentable utility.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 22 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Urien (US 7,130,910 B2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 22 recites a computer equipment item comprising input/output means allowing messages to be transmitted and/or received in an interactive dialogue with another computer equipment item, calculation means connected to said input/output means, a working random access memory and at least one programmable, non-volatile memory, wherein the equipment item comprises, written in the non-volatile memory, at least, *inter alia*, a list of behavior identifiers defined in an interactive dialogue.

It is acknowledged elsewhere in the Office Action that “Urien fails to disclose a list of behavior identifiers.” (Office Action, page 5.)

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Urien fails to disclose the computer equipment item of claims 22 and 23 having written in a non-volatile memory, *inter alia*, a list of behavior identifiers.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103

1) Claims 1 – 14 and 24:

Claims 1 – 14 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urien in view of Maillard et al. (US 2002/0129249 A1) (“Maillard”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 recites a process for adapting a degree of interactivity between a participant computer equipment item and a reciprocal participant computer equipment item of a set of participant computer equipment items, when this participant computer equipment item and this reciprocal participant computer equipment item are subjected to an interactive dialogue, wherein the process comprises, *inter alia*,

- b) writing, into the memory of said participant computer equipment item, a list of behavior identifiers, said behaviors being relevant in said interactive dialogue;
- c) writing, into the memory of said participant computer equipment item, at least one association between a computer equipment identifier and a behavior identifier and, in order to execute this interactive dialogue, when this participant computer equipment item and at least one reciprocal participant computer equipment item are in each other's presence;
- d) carrying out a procedure of authentication between said participant computer equipment item and said reciprocal participant computer equipment item, and
 - searching for the identifier of the authenticated reciprocal participant computer equipment item in said list of identifiers;
 - reading said associated behavior identifier; and
 - applying, at the participant computer equipment item, a behavior relative to the authenticated reciprocal participant computer equipment item, this behavior being selected as a function of the result of the authentication procedure and

associated with the behavior identifier and with the identifier of the reciprocal participant computer equipment item.
(emphasis added)

As explained in the present application, these features overcome drawbacks of the prior art and, particularly, allow adaptation of the behavior of the equipment items when interacting (i.e., in an interactive dialogue).

It is acknowledged in the Office Action that "Urien fails to disclose a list of behavior identifiers." (Office Action, page 5.) Nonetheless, it is contended in the Office Action that Malliard provides such a disclosure (Office Action, page 5.) This contention is respectfully traversed.

Malliard relates to a smartcard for use with a receiver of encrypted broadcast signals in a broadcast and reception system, a receiver / decoder for receiving and decrypting broadcast signals, apparatus for broadcasting encrypted signals and a method of broadcasting encrypted signals (Malliard, paragraph [0001]). Malliard specifically discloses a smartcard comprising an identifier and at least one secret decryption key associated with a respective broadcast supplier (Malliard, paragraph [0013]).

Without conceding the propriety of combining Urien and Malliard references, and reading the "decryption key" of Malliard as a "behavior identifier," it is respectfully submitted that the "decryption key" of Malliard is completely different from the "behavior identifier" recited in claim 1. The "decryption key" of Malliard is used with a receiver for decrypting encrypted signals, and does not interact in any way with the broadcast equipment that transmits the encrypted signals. Thus, the "decryption key" of Malliard does not constitute and cannot be read as a "behavior identifier" that is relevant in an interactive dialog between a "participant computer equipment item" and a "reciprocal participant computer equipment item," as recited in claim 1. Thus, the teachings of Malliard clearly do not make up the conceded deficiency in Urien.

Claims 2 – 14 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 1.

Claim 24 depends from claim 22, discussed above, and recites means for processing, *inter alia*, a list of behavior identifiers, and a list of associations between an equipment identifier and a behavior identifier. It is respectfully submitted that the arguments presented with respect to claim 1 are also applicable to claim 24.

2) Claims 15, 16 and 18 – 21:

Claims 15, 16 and 18 – 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urien in view of Malliard and in further view of Alve et al. (US 2003/0196089 A1) (“Alve”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 15, 16 and 18 – 21 depend from independent claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Alve does not provide a disclosure that remedies the deficiencies of Urien and Malliard as discussed above, and, therefore, that claims 15, 16 and 18 – 21 are allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 1.

3) Claim 17:


Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urien in view of Malliard in further view of Alve and in further view of Arkin et al. (US 2002/0152262 A1) (“Arkin”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 depends from independent claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Arkin also fails to provide a disclosure that remedies the deficiencies of Urien, Malliard, and Alve as discussed above, and, therefore, that claim 17 is allowable for at least the reasons provided in support of the allowability of claim 1.

Allowance of the application in its present form is respectfully solicited.

Date: Nov. 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

 REG. NO. 40,630
FOR

By: Ross F. Hunt, Jr.

Registration No.: 24082

STITES & HARBISON PLLC ♦ 1199 North Fairfax St. ♦ Suite 900 ♦ Alexandria, VA 22314
TEL: 703-739-4900 ♦ FAX: 703-739-9577 ♦ CUSTOMER NO. 000881